REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 16-17, and 20-23 have been amended (as shown on pp. 3-6 of the Reply, and as discussed during the examiner interview conducted on March 5, 2007) solely to cure typographical errors and place the claims in proper form. No change in claim scope is intended. In addition, the specification has been amended (as indicated on p. 2), also to cure typographical errors.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Objection to Claims 3, 21, and 22

Claims 3, 21, and 22 stand objected to for being of improper dependent form for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of the herein amendments to these claims.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants' representative has amended these claims and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

III.   Summary of the Invention

The present invention relates to systems and methods that facilitate previewing content of stacked or grouped information displays in an efficient manner. Dynamically-generated collections of documents or files can be represented as single icons or entities, and form part of the next generation file system user interfaces. The subject invention provides an improved method for navigating the collection *via* an axial user interface controller such as a mouse wheel, for example, to interactively preview the contents of a group (such as a folder) in order to observe or review individual elements of the collection without navigating into (*e.g.,* double-clicking) the collection.

In one example aspect, the user moves a mouse cursor over a collection icon and a small preview image of the first document or page in the collection is shown. The user may then increment or decrement the axial controller to display the next (or former) document preview icon. A transitional animation can be employed to visually link the movement of the axial controller with the change in the displayed icon, wherein the user can quickly "flip" or scroll through many document previews quickly. When the user moves the curser away from the collection icon, the currently selected preview image can be integrated with the collection icon as a reminder of collection contents.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Card, et al. US 7,069,518 (hereinafter "Card").

Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Card does not anticipate claim 1 at least because Card does not teach "at least one display object having *metadata tags*. . ." and "a control component configured to selectively animate a presentation of the items *based at least in part on the metadata tags*. . . ."

As discussed in the specification at paragraph 29, a document collection 300 and associated tags are illustrated in Figure 3 in accordance with one aspect of the present invention. In this aspect, a collection 300 of documents, sheets, files, or items is depicted having a plurality of members in the collection. As illustrated, respective members can be associated with a metadata tag illustrated as tags 1 through T, T being an integer. Thus, when the collection 300 is selected, items in the collection can be indexed, processed and cycled for display via the metadata tags.

On the other hand, the Office Action incorrectly contends that the table of contents of Card's virtual book is equivalent to the claimed metadata tags. However, *assuming arguendo* that even if Card's virtual book could be construed as a display object and the table of contents construed as metadata tags of the book, Card does not disclose "a control component configured to selectively animate a presentation of the items *based at least in part on the metadata tags*. . . ." The Office Action contends that column 9, lines 63-66, of Card, reproduced below, supplies this teaching.

> In order to permit optimal functionality with simple gestures, the user may change the size and position of objects by, for example, holding down a mouse button while moving across the image of the object. [Col. 9, lines 63-66]

However, although the Office Action equates Card's mouse with the applicants' claimed control component and Card's table of contents with applicants' metadata tags, Card's mouse is not configured to selectively animate a presentation of items based at least in part on Card's table of contents as in applicants' claimed invention. Rather, any change in size and position of objects would, according to Card, be based entirely on the user's click and drag operation using the mouse. For at least this reason, applicants' representative respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1.

For similar reasons, it is submitted that Card does not anticipate claim 22 at least because Card does not teach "*a tag* associated with each member page from the group of pages" and "an axial controller to cycle the group of pages *using the associated tags*." Nor does the Office Action assert in the rejection of this claim that Card teaches such tags. For at least this reason, applicants' representative respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22.

Applicant also traverses the rejection of claim 17. In support of its rejection, the Office Action erroneously contends that column 12, lines 43-50, of Card, reproduced below, anticipates this claim.

> For slow flipping speed, i.e., where the user does not *move the cursor* far after initiating the page flipping process, a full animation is provided to show each individual page flipping. In this way, all information for the displayed page is mapped onto the flipping page. Further, by *moving the cursor* back and forth, the user can very selectively control the flipping of the page by, for example, stopping it in mid-flip, or moving the flipped page back and forth. [Col. 12, lines 43-50, emphasis added]

However, despite the fact that method claim 17 specifies "selecting a stack of display items with a *first control*" and "cycling the stack of display items with a *second control*", the Office Action equates Card's cursor with both applicants' claimed first control *and* second control. The Office Action suggests that the second reference to

"moving the cursor" is somehow associated with a wheel of a mouse, but Card contains no such suggestion. Rather, according to the excerpt above, Card's page flipping is controlled by a single control – namely, the cursor. Whether the user is flipping pages forward or backward, or stopping in mid-flip, Card's user is utilizing a single control. For at least this reason, Applicants' representative respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 17.

It is also respectfully submitted that Card does not anticipate claim 16. This claim recites, in part, "means for *detecting a value* with respect to the set of information items" and "means for previewing the information items *based upon incrementing or decrementing the value*." The Office Action argues that column 1, line 65, through column 2, line 1, of Card, reproduced below along with the rest of the paragraph, anticipates this claim.

> A typical method of displaying an electronic document is to represent the document as a continuous scroll with an associated scroll-bar for advancing the displayed representation. Most word processing programs and Web browsers utilize this scroll metaphor for displaying electronic information. The display of electronic documents as a continuous scroll, in the conventional manner, may possess a number of deficiencies in displaying certain types of documents. For example, users may have difficulty accessing and interacting with information when a conventional scroll is applied to a large document. [Col. 1, line 65, through col. 2, line 8]

The Office Action, at page 7, equates an electronic document with applicants' claimed set of information items and argues that "[i]t is inherent that a value is selected and detects a value when using a scroll bar scrolls down a set of information items (i.e., means for selecting and detecting)." However, clam 16 recites "means for selecting *the set of information items*" (rather than the value) and "means for detecting a *value with respect to the set of information items*." Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees that detecting a value with respect to a set of information items is inherent when using a scroll bar. According to MPEP § 2112, the Office must provide rationale or evidence tending to show inherency. Even if using a scroll bar involves detecting a value with respect to the scroll bar (Applicants' representative offers no opinion regarding this

10

issue), claim 16 clearly recites that the value detected is with respect to the *set of information items*. A scroll bar would clearly not be a set of information items, as the term is used both in this claim and through the specification. Thus, for at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16 is requested.

Each of claims 2-15, 18-21, and 23 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 22, respectively, and are allowable as depending from allowable base claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which in combination with those recited in their respective base claims, are not taught or suggested by Card.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063[MSFTP544US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731